

ought always to be.—*N. Y. Eve Post*

Mr. H. B. Knight has been appointed publishing agent of the American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, in place of L. J. Bates, resigned; and is also the authorized agent of the *Era* for the city of New York, and may be found at No. 45 Beekman street.

Post & Co., Periodical Agents, Third street, near Main, Cincinnati, are authorized to receive subscriptions for the *Era*. Single copies of the paper may also be had of them at all times.

Mr. Caleb A. Wall is our authorized agent for Worcester, Mass.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 22, 1853.

OUR DAILY.

We laid before our readers last week the difficulties attending the establishment of a Daily, but committed ourselves to the undertaking. Let us add now, that as next Monday week is the day fixed for issuing the first number, no time is to be lost by any one who feels disposed to help forward the enterprise. But, one week is enough for such work, where the will exists. You can do as much in one week as one month, only begin to move, and keep moving.

First, we want advertisements. Let no one, anxious that our Daily should succeed, wait for somebody else to get them. In Boston, New York, Philadelphia, and Baltimore, we have many friends, in business, who are in the habit of advertising, and whose daily associations are with the business world. If they choose, they can send us by the first of January as many advertisements as our columns will admit; and if they do, it will be no charity offering; for a newspaper that circulates through its weekly twenty-eight thousand copies all over the country, especially among classes dealing with those cities, must be a first-rate advertising medium.

Next, we want subscribers. Do not wait for an agent to call on you. Be your own agent; and if you know anybody favorably disposed, induce him to join with you. Let every one, who wishes the enterprise to succeed, take a personal responsibility in the matter. We assume a pretty heavy one, and certainly without the remotest idea of gain or gratification.

Finally, as the rule is to be reversed in our case, the Weekly supporting the Daily, instead of the Daily supporting the Weekly, we must again urge upon our friends the necessity of keeping up our weekly list of subscribers. If they fail in this, we shall certainly publish the Daily on our own resources, all its appointed time; but the experiment will in all probability be the last of the kind.

Slavery, Monopoly, time-serving Conservatism, Compromise Whiggery and Democracy, have their daily organs here, at the seat of the Federal Government. The question now submitted, is, Are there enough People in the country, willing and able to sustain here, a Daily Journal, opposed outright to Slavery, Monopoly, time-serving conservatism, Compromise Whiggery and Democracy, and pledged to follow out the Democratic Principle in all its logical and legitimate applications?

Who speaks? "Fuzzy Guzz" is always welcome, name and all. He shall discourse next week in our columns.

THE NEW VOLUME.—For the new volume, commencing in January, we have on hand, a continuation of "My Summer with Dr. Singletary," by WHITTIER, "A Brother's Recollections of an Only Sister," by Mary Irving, "Secret Societies in France," by an English writer, "Aristocracy in England," a continuation of the series of monthly political articles, furnished for the *Era* by one of the foremost Liberals of England, &c., &c.

BELL SMITH.—See another Letter this week from Bell Smith.

CLUBS.—Agents and others, in making up clubs, are at liberty to send from as many different post offices as they may think proper.

THE SAXON SERV.—Chapter V came too late for insertion this week—it will appear in our next issue.

EXCHANGES.—We feel it a duty, no less than a pleasure, to exchange with every paper committed to the cause with which the *Era* is identified, whether it notice our Prospects or not. If any such has been cut off, it has been done through mistake.

FACTS FOR THE PEOPLE.—"The Southern Platform," by Mr. Goodloe, is now closed. A more valuable collection of documents in relation to Southern sentiment and action on Slavery has never appeared. It is all reprinted in *Facts for the People*, and will serve in this convenient form for permanent reference. Hereafter, that monthly publication will be filled with articles designed more particularly for circulation among those not yet fully initiated into the facts of the Anti-Slavery movement.

COMMITTEES IN THE SENATE.

The Managers this year in the Senate, ashamed of their conduct, at the last session, in excluding Messrs. Chase and Sumner from all the committees, determined to pursue a different course. The Democrats proposed to provide for Mr. Chase, and suggested to the Whigs to provide for Mr. Sumner. Accordingly, Mr. Chase was placed on several committees, but in the Whig caucus, a proposition by Mr. Seward, to make an arrangement for Mr. Sumner, was opposed by Mr. Everett, his colleague, and defeated.

We cannot help contrasting this conduct of Mr. Everett with the magnanimous behaviour of Mr. Dickinson of New York, who, while in the Senate, as we learn from good authority, never would consent to any degradation of his colleague, because of a degradation of political office, but always insisted upon assigning to him such positions as his ability and his relations to the State of New York fairly entitled him to. Would that such magnanimity were more common among politicians.

FILLIBUSTERING IN CALIFORNIA.

The newspapers are publishing a letter from one of a band of forty or fifty land-robbers, from California, who lately made a descent upon Lower California, declared its independence of Mexico, and affected to set up an independent Government.

According to the account, they went so far as to appoint a President of the new republic, and organize a Cabinet. It would seem, however, that they were unable to keep the mighty republic long on its legs, as later accounts say that they had re-embarked, and were cruising towards San Diego. The correspondent of the *Baltimore Sun* says:

"I find it stated in a New York paper, likely to be well informed, that General Alamo, the Mexican Minister, has called the attention of this Government to the fact of this buccannery enterprise. But, if so, he is as rich in gold as it is supposed, it will be very difficult for this Government to keep our people out of it. The Mexican Government may be induced, making a merit of necessity, to cede to us a large slice of Sonora for a fair consideration, for she cannot even defend the territory from the Indians."

If our Government is not able to punish and prevent such infamous buccannery as this, it is ought to abdicate.

To show the character and intention of these

Fillibusters, it is enough to say that in their proclamation they announced for their government the code and practice of Louisiana. California, with all its extent, and wealth, and capabilities, does not satisfy them, because it is a free State.

More energetic measures must be taken by the President to restrain these forays on Mexico, or trouble will grow out of them. Nothing would gratify a portion of our South-western population more than to become embroiled with that country.

Even now, we apprehend, notwithstanding the pacific tone of the Presidential Message, our relations with it are not of the most friendly nature. A telegraphic despatch dated New Orleans, December 11th, announces that Mr. Minister, Mr. Gadsden, had demanded the immediate confirmation of the Garay grant, threatening that, if refused, the Americans would take possession of the Mesilla Valley. If negotiations have reached that pitch, to say the least, they do not promise the most peaceful results.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS.

The reader will find, by an analysis of the committees in the Senate, that the Slave Power as usual has assumed the control of the most important of them.

The same remark, though not to the same extent, may be made of the House committees. Houston, of Alabama, is Chairman of the Committee of Ways and Means; Bayly, of Virginia, of the Committee on Foreign Affairs; Rusk, of Virginia, of the Committee on Naval Affairs; and on all these, together with the Committees on Claims and on Territories, the slaveholders have the majority.

PUBLIC PRINTER TO THE SENATE.

The *Washington Sentinel* claims membership with the Democratic party, but represents that portion of it which has been disaffected by the policy of the Administration in regard to appointments to office. It is, in fact, an opponent of the Administration, and its support can have no other effect than to weaken the ruling party.

The election of the editor of this journal as Public Printer to the Senate, discloses the fact that there is a majority in that body, Democratic as it is known to be in its organization, disposed to act, when it sees proper, without any reference to the policy or wishes of the President.

The *Washington Star*, which has been prying into the matter, tells us that of the sixteen Whig Senators present, fourteen voted for Tucker—that Messrs. Chase, Sumner, and Seward, supported him—that he also received the votes of nine Administration Senators; viz: Weller, of California, Bright, of Indiana, Evans, of South Carolina, Atchison, of Missouri, Brodhead, of Pennsylvania, Mason, and Hunter, of Virginia, and Wright of New Jersey.

The Union takes the matter to heart, and is rather ungracious to the Senate. It says:

"We have no reason to believe that the Democratic Senators who united with the Whigs and Abolitionists to defeat General Armstrong, were actuated by personal opposition to him, nor have we any reason to suppose that it was the result of personal objections to the editor of the *Union*. We are forced to regard their course as dictated by political considerations; and as our support of the Administration has been constant, and as we are not disposed to attribute to it no other motive than opposition to the policy of the Administration. Having heretofore sustained that policy against all assaults, whether from Whigs, Abolitionists, or real Democrats, we shall neither abate our zeal nor modify our energies under the present circumstances. We know that the President stands immovably upon his policy, and that he will not be driven from his faithful execution by any combination or coalition that may be formed, however formidable it may seem to be."

We should think that the printing of the last Congress and the printing of the present House of Representatives ought to satisfy any man of moderate acquiescence. The *Union* is not so easily appeased. Solomon wrote, "There are three things that are never satisfied, yea, four things say not, it is enough; the grave; and the barren womb; the earth, that is not filled with water; and the fire that saith not, it is enough." Were Solomon to give us a new edition of his Proverbs, he would add to this schedule, "a newspaper subsisting upon Government patronage, which also saith not, it is enough."

But the *Union* does not choose to consider the transaction so much in the money view, as in the light of principle. There is a majority in the Senate hostile to the Administration; the *Union* is the pillar of the Administration; hence this Senatorial blow. The *Union* is smitten on account of its devotion to Principle; the hostile majority seeks its overthrow, for the purpose of prostrating the Administration. Whigs, Abolitionists, and disaffected Democrats, have formed a vile coalition against it. It is not to be intimidated—it will confront, with a calm, determined courage, its enemies and the claims of the Administration, and wage war against them "to the bitter end."

"It may be highly presumptuous in us to question the infallibility of Senators; but when we have good reason to believe that a deliberate coalition has been formed for the purpose of embarrassing the Administration and dividing and breaking down the Democratic party, we cannot be restrained by our respect for the Senatorial office from speaking our mind."

As to the nine Democratic Senators, "if they choose to form coalitions with Whigs and Abolitionists, they have a perfect right to do so, and they are certainly welcome to all the benefits of their new associations; but the history of the Democratic party furnishes many precedents which teach us that such defections are disastrous to those who thus seek to avenge supposed injuries, or to gratify unreasonable aspirations for political promotion. For all such, this Administration, controlled and managed by one whose Democracy has never been questioned—by one who never sought to rise upon coalitions with Whigs or Abolitionists—by one who stands by Democratic organizations as second only in importance to Democratic principles—for all such, we say, this Administration has nothing but defiance, and towards all such the *Union* will continue to direct the popular Democratic sentiment, as enemies to Democratic principles, no matter what high professions they may make."

"Enemies to Democratic principle," because they do not see proper to make the proprietor of the *Union*, Public Printer to the Senate!

As for the *Sentinel*, we have not a particle of sympathy with it, or any other paper that will descend to become a recipient of Congressional patronage. The alliance between Congress and the newspaper press here, is corrupt and corrupting, inconsistent with the independence of the press, tending to subject the minority of the People's Representatives to insolent dictation. In Washington, as elsewhere, a newspaper should be obliged to rely upon its merits; and were this the rule, there might be fewer papers here, but they would be higher-toned, abler, and more independent. Divorce the newspaper press from every department of the Government—leave it in a position where it cannot be used as an instrument of Executive despotism or a proscriber majority in Congress, but where its very existence shall depend upon the fidelity with which it shall expose the abuses of Government, and vindicate the rights and interests of the People.

THE PARAMOUNT QUESTION.

"There is no intelligent man, of any party or section of the United States, who does not know and feel that the question of Slavery is the vital question of this Republic—more important in its bearings upon the destiny of the American People than all other questions, political, moral, and religious, combined. Politicians may cry peace, peace; but there is no peace for the slaveholder. Partisan intrigues may counsel silence and submission, in the face of incessant machinations against the institution, at home and abroad. But eternal vigilance is the only guard of safety for the friends of the Union and People of the South. Upon the final settlement of this question in our own National Councils and organizations, depend the commercial prosperity of the United States, the permanency of the Union, and all the hopes and destinies of mankind that are staked upon the success of Free Government."—*Richmond (Va.) Examiner*.

The *Examiner* is one of the boldest agitators in the South. Its whole course proves that it believes Slavery to be "the paramount question," "the vital question of the Republic." It is always discussing it, always denouncing the Anti-Slavery sentiment of the world, always urging, in the most offensive style, the extreme pretensions of the Slave Power. In the article opened by the paragraph above quoted, it proceeds to say that the odds against Slavery would seem to be overwhelming. Great Britain seeks its destruction, because its maintenance threatens to transfer the sceptre of commerce to this Republic. European Governments hate it, because they are "aristocratic and tyrannical, implacably hostile to this country," the basis of whose prosperity and ambition they know to be laid in Slavery. "Pharisaical religionists" and "Socialist dreamers" detest it. "The slaveholding States are begirt with a circle of fire." Open assaults they have defied and baffled. The political onslaught in 1848 against them utterly failed; but the leaders on that occasion have not changed their purposes—they have become more cunning. Crying out peace, peace, clamoring for a general amnesty, they are only concerning a more deadly assault. Never was there greater need of vigilance and concert on the part of slaveholders.

The closing paragraph shows the tactics of the Slave Power, and to what it looks for support and supremacy:

"There is but one remedy for the evil—but one shield against the danger; and if the South fail to use both, she will deserve the inevitable fate of the Canaanite. With the assistance of a heroic, patriotic, and fearless band, large in number, great in intellect and integrity, at the North, who are with us for the country's sake, the South can control the action of the Federal Government. This power should be so exercised as to 'crush out' really and truly, the Free-Soil element, and to reduce to a mere shadow, or to no peace or order allowed the insidious enemy. 'Crush it out!' should be the shibboleth and the watchword. This should be the answer to every Free-Soil, fanatical, aspirant to office and hunter after emolument. Anybody, however, who dares to stand forth for the rights of the free, and honestly renounced their sinful ways, and performed works meet for repentance. All other questions sink into insignificance before this, and the slang about treason to party, which flunkeyism is always ready to put forth to shield a patron, is dispensed with forever. The South, should be self-acted and contented. There can be no treason where men array themselves upon the side of right and their country."

With the assistance of Northern men, slaveholders have controlled, to a great extent, "the action of the Federal Government" since the days of John Adams the elder; but although they have succeeded by this means in bolstering up their barbarous system against the spirit of the age, the law of progress, and the legitimate workings of the Federal Constitution, they have utterly failed to silence free discussion, to check agitation, to "crush out" the Anti-Slavery sentiment of the country, to secure for themselves undisputed ascendancy.

For more than half a century they have been laboring for a "final settlement" of all controversy in relation to Slavery, by nationalizing it, in gross defiance of the pledges implied in the Declaration of Independence, the great charter of our independent existence as a Republic—and of the known intentions of the framers of the Federal Constitution. Instead of regarding it as local, exclusively existing within State jurisdiction, a matter solely for State legislation, from the organization of the Government to this date, they have tried to exalt it to the dignity of a National Institution, to invest it with constitutional sanction, to train the People to look upon it as the cornerstone of our social and political system—to make it appear the one great National interest—in a word, to use the Federal Union as the mere instrument of its will and benefit. They have certainly played this desperate game boldly, adroitly, and with a certain degree of success; but they have never had peace. Their pretensions have always been challenged—their usurpations always resisted, sometimes successfully—their rule has always been impatiently subverted to their gross ambition has always provoked agitation. But they will persist in the policy which has kept them in power, and their system in jeopardy, and the country in a state of agitation for half a century. They will continue to stigmatize as dreamers, pharisees, fanaticism, incendiaries, fanatics, traitors, those who resist their policy. They will exact, as they have always done, that the whole American People shall bear the burden of Slavery, legislate for it, spend money for it, provide new territory for it, fight for it—and denounce those of them as fanatical, unpatriotic agitators, who decline such services. But are they fools enough to imagine that a "final settlement" of the great question is to be brought about in such a way?

Is the ascendancy of Louis Napoleon a "final settlement" of the question of constitutional government in France? Is the present law regulating suffrage in England a "final settlement" of popular suffrage in that country? Has the resumption by the Pope of his temporal power at Rome "finally settled" the question in controversy between him and his subjects? Is the subjugation of Italy by the bayonets of Austria a "final settlement" of the question of its independence? Is the present ascendancy of Despotism in Central Europe a "final settlement" of the great controversy between Might and Right?

There is but one way of finally settling any Question; and that is, by deciding it in accordance with Truth and Justice; and the sooner this be done, the better for the cause of Peace and Concord. Human nature, by the law of its being, can rest satisfied with nothing short of this.

The only way to settle the question of Slavery, so far as the Federal Government and the Union of these States are concerned, is for all parties to agree to regard and treat it as a system strictly within State authority, without claim to any protection beyond that limit—for which the Federal Government should assume no responsibility, and in relation to which it should relieve itself of whatever responsibility it has assumed. Adopt this principle, and there will be an end to Federal Fugitive Laws, to Slavery in territory of the United States, to any regulations or laws sanctioning, or giving countenance in any respect or degree, to Slavery and the slave trade. The entire question will then be committed to the several States in which the system exists, and the only way in which it can be "finally settled" therein, will be by the enfranchisement of all classes of their population, and their investiture with the rights of freemen.

AMENDMENTS TO THE CONSTITUTION.

Mr. Mace, of Indiana, has introduced a resolution, proposing that Senators of the United States hereafter be elected by the People of the several States, instead of by the Legislatures. We trust the proposition may receive the attention it deserves. The election of Senators for six years, and by the State Legislatures, is not in harmony with the Democratic Principle, or with the doctrine of self-government. It diminishes their accountability to the People; it not infrequently prevents the People from being fairly represented.

The People are as capable of determining who shall be Senators, as who shall be President, or Representatives. The Principle of State Sovereignty, supposed to be specially represented by Senators, would be as truly represented if they were elected by the People of a State, as it is now, when they are elected by the Legislature. And the reduction of their terms from six to four years, while it would not impair the requisite stability of the Senate, as a part of the Executive power, would bring it more under popular influence. This, of course, would be the most conclusive reason against the proposed change, with those who distrust the Democratic Principle, but not with those who believe in the ability of the People to govern themselves, and who can find little in the conservatism of the Supreme Court or of the Senate—the two bodies in our political system furthest removed from popular influence—favorable to the Cause of Progress and Humanity.

Another amendment is proposed in the House by Mr. Ewing, to the mode of electing the President and Vice President of the United States. The *Intelligencer* remarks: "In this latter proposition we recognize an old acquaintance, it having been heretofore several times brought to the attention of Congress by members from various sections of the Union. 'In February, 1824, Mr. Benton, Senator from Missouri, moved amendments to the Constitution of the United States, as follows: '1. To divide the United States into electoral districts. '2. To discontinue the use of intermediate electors. '3. To commit the election of President and Vice President to a direct vote of the people. '4. To continue an umirage of the House of Representatives when no majority is given. 'And these propositions were supported with the accustomed power of their author. 'In regard to this proposed amendment, the Hon. Rufus King, of New York, made a speech marked by his usual clearness and force. He argued principally against the centralizing influence of the proposed change. He was decided in his opposition to the caucus system (the prevalent), and concluded in the following words: 'All that is the work of man is, like him, imperfect. We probably enjoy a greater portion of freedom and happiness than falls to the lot of other nations; and because we desire yet more, we must be careful not to lose what we have, by hasty and partial alterations in our plan of government. He would therefore prefer to adhere for the present to the Constitution as it is, in hopes that adequate means may be devised to suppress this great and alarming evil (slavery), which is now opposing the Constitution itself by controlling and superseding its wise and well-considered provisions.'"

"Well," means have been adopted. The caucus system has been superseded by a system of conventions; but whether the popular will is truly expressed, or reduced to a very doubtful, to say the least. Had Mr. King lived twenty years longer, we very much question whether his objection to Mr. Benton's plan to dispense with the machinery of electoral colleges (now so perverted from their original theory and design) would not have been much weakened, if not entirely removed."

This is an unexpected admission from so staid a journal as the *National Intelligencer*. An evil must indeed have reached a great height, when the *Intelligencer* gives countenance to any attempt to reform it. We presume nine-tenths of the People of the United States are disgusted with the Convention system of nominations, and that they would hail any change that would secure to the whole People their just rights in this matter of a Presidential election. Mr. Benton's proposition could be taken as a basis of reform, although it might be well to substitute for the fourth, a reference to the People again, where no majority is given, of the choice between the two candidates having the highest number of votes.

At all events, let the subject be brought fairly before Congress, and fully considered, so that a wholesome change may be effected, if possible.

Whig and Democratic presses are discussing the basis of union in their respective parties. It were more pertinent to discuss the causes of their divisions. Each is rent by factions, but their adherents do not seem to be aware of the fact. What fellowship has the Union with the *Evening Post*, or the *Intelligencer* with the *Tribune*?

No union was effected at Baltimore, by the National Convention of either party. A suspension of hostilities was agreed upon, for the single purpose of electing a President, the several factions intending to renew their struggles after that event.

BASIS OF UNION IN THE OLD PARTIES.

The "organ" lately, in one of its thousand sermons on the Baltimore platform, remarked that the basis of union agreed upon at Baltimore was not an approval of the Compromise Measures, but merely an acquiescence in them, and a pledge to abide by them. Southern Whigs sneered at the remark, assiduously a change of position. The *Boston Post* and the *Richmond (Va.) Enquirer* back the Union, and charge home upon the Whigs, that their Convention went no further than the Democratic—taking the ground of acquiescence, not of approval.

This is true. Both parties through their National Conventions, authorized to speak for the measures of the Compromise which were thought detrimental to Southern interests, it explicitly and emphatically approves the measures in which the only concession was made to the demands of the South."

Of a similar opinion is the "organ," which insists that the Fugitive Slave Law is the vital portion of the Compromise. But, on this point the South is divided, for the *Charleston (S. C.) Mercury* says: "The South has gained nothing but a loss by this law. It was a stupid blunder on the part of Southern statesmen. The value of the law is eaten up by capture follows, while hatred to the institution abroad and opposition to it at home are increased by its hard features and the barbarous enforcement of them."

Wherein the Abolitionists entirely concur with the *Mercury*. The *Charleston (S. C.) Standard* goes still further, taking the ground that this "vital portion" of the Compromise is unconstitutional.

It is true that powers, not conferred upon Congress, are resorted to by the States respectively, or to the people; it is also true, that there is no power conferred by this clause (Fugitive Slave) of the Constitution upon Congress to carry its provisions into effect. And instead of clinging to this provision of the Compromise act, as a compensation for its other most objectionable features, it might be well for us to consider whether we have not, in fact, made a concession more fatal to our separate and distinct political existence, than even the founders of the Constitution themselves were prepared to make."

That must be a most stable basis of union, about which there are so many discordant opinions, and on which you can get no party in the country to stand.

As to the pledge to acquiesce in, adhere to, and abide by, the Compromise Measures, it was understood to be directed against all agitation of questions relating to Slavery, and yet, everybody, North and South, has been agitating such questions, from the President down to Bennett's Herald. Almost every important election in both sections has involved this very element. Even the Supreme Bench has contributed its share to the agitation. The Compromise, in fact, was a conclusion in which nothing was concluded, but the political prospects of the most conspicuous in forcing it through Congress.

SENATOR ATCHISON AND THE TERRITORY OF NEBRASKA.

In the *Glasgow Weekly Times* of November 17th, a paper published at Glasgow, Missouri, there appears what purports to be a "Synopsis of Senator Atchison's Speech, delivered at Fayette, Monday, November 14th, 1853, reprinted for the *Times*." The topic of the speech is the organization of a Territorial Government for Nebraska.

In the first place, he takes issue with Col. Benton on the question of the legality of white settlement in Nebraska. The Colonel had asserted that three-fourths of the Territory are open to settlement—Mr. Atchison asserts that not one foot of it is open for settlement. In arguing the question, Mr. Atchison, who has been elevated to the dignity of President of the Senate of the United States, spoke of Benton's "egotism and egotism," his "slang," his "falseness and falsehoods," his "lies," his arguments, that "would disgrace any pettifogger in the State."

"In his (Benton's) monomania, the signs of a self-regard every shadow of self-respect, or regard for truth; nothing is too high or holy for his animadversions and misrepresentations. In him the honors of office and the gray hairs of age are alike prostituted to the unholy purpose of giving credit to his fifty vituperations. Even Congress by him is dragged from the high position of reflecting the sentiments of an intelligent and virtuous people, to the low embarras of a common court-scan. 'From the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh,' is an assertion of Holy Writ, that points to the steep from which emanates all this loathsome effluvia—Benton's heart—the blackness of whose conceptions would induce a Nero to pluck it from his polluted bosom; and yet he would sit as an umpire upon the actions of Congress, which he denounces for its ignorance and stupidity."

We copy from the report in the *Times*. The Senate of the United States, of which Mr. Atchison is President, aspires, we believe, to Roman dignity and decorum. The courtly President proceeds to submit various considerations in support of his views on the question of settlement, and then remarks—

"These arguments, which are substantially those in Mr. Manypenny's letter, he gave to Manypenny before he saw his letter—thus disproving Benton's charge of ignorance. "Mr. Atchison, in his letter, which Mr. Manypenny's letter was shown to the Cabinet, and contains the views of the Administration, and was deemed of such importance, lest the false views of Benton should have a deleterious influence, that it was published in the organ of the Administration on the evening of the same day upon which it was written."

Mr. Manypenny has manifested some indignation against the *New York Evening Post* and *National Era*, for expressing an apprehension founded upon the reports of several Missouri papers, that he had been acting in concert with the enemies of the organization of a Territorial Government in Nebraska; but he cannot blame us in view of the avowed made by Mr. Atchison, that he "gave to Manypenny" the arguments against the settlement of Nebraska. We have been assured that this is not the fact—that Mr. Manypenny had no connection whatever with Mr. Atchison, and we give him the benefit of this statement.

But the most important part of the speech of the Senate's President relates to the Question of Slavery, as connected with the subject of a Territorial Government. We copy again from the "Synopsis":

"Mr. Atchison had opposed Nebraska, and would oppose it, unless the Missouri Compromise act were repealed, although in the last Congress he well nigh waived his opposition at the solicitation of his colleague—yet, upon mature reflection, he opposed his bill, believing, among other reasons, that it would be an injury to Missouri, to thus remove from the evitable position she now occupies as a 'Slave State.' The free States—the States of California, trade, which she had so long possessed with such marked advantages, would then be cut off."

"He opposed Nebraska, from his unwillingness to violate existing treaties; again, he opposed it, because it would be throwing around Missouri State the reputation of the tendency of which would be to still further jeopardize our Slave Interest. And lastly, he opposed it upon principle, as his admission, upon the Missouri Compromise of 1820, would be to deprive his constituents the right of carrying their property there."

"Colonel Benton had announced in the Senate that there was not one foot of slave territory now belonging to the United States, the stipulation in the treaty ceding Louisiana and New Mexico having excluded it. Clay and Webster having asserted the same thing, he took their word for it, and intended in this matter to act as a man of honor. He would not now resign, did he not to violate the common blood and treasure which he could not do this without violating his principles, which he never intended to do. Policy may sometimes be compromised—principles never. Forty millions of dollars had been paid by slaveholders, in common with those of free States, for Louisiana, and there had been millions of slaves in the States—the territory which had obtained all the territory of this great and growing country; therefore no power beneath the sun could ever compel him to apply the Missouri Compromise in the admission of Nebraska, whereby three-fourths of his constituents would be denied the privilege of taking their property there."

"As soon as the Indian tribes are extinguished, he is willing to vote for it, if the Missouri Compromise is not applied; otherwise he would resign before he would vote for it, and thus willingly do violence to the sacred interests of his State, and he would now resign, did he not to violate the common blood and treasure which he could not do this without violating his principles, which he never intended to do. Policy may sometimes be compromised—principles never. Forty millions of dollars had been paid by slaveholders, in common with those of free States, for Louisiana, and there had been millions of slaves in the States—the territory which had obtained all the territory of this great and growing country; therefore no power beneath the sun could ever compel him to apply the Missouri Compromise in the admission of Nebraska, whereby three-fourths of his constituents would be denied the privilege of taking their property there."

The seal of the Attorney General has only anticipated the natural result of the affair. The manner and time of doing it, however, have been such as to stimulate and augment the strength of that very Abolitionism which it was designed to "crush out." The sparks are flying in the faces of those who sought to trample on the fire. The amount of smothered indignation and silent disgust in the Old Democratic party of Massachusetts, can scarcely be over-estimated; and there is little doubt that many of them are prepared to coalesce with us, not on local grounds alone, but upon the platform of hostility to Slavery and the Federal policy and centralizing tendencies of the General Government.

That the Free Democracy itself will profit by the new state of things, we have no reason to doubt. Its attention will no longer be diverted to local matters and side issues. It will devote itself with renewed vigor to the great question to which it owes its origin. Our friends in other States may rest assured that its leading advocates have no disposition to quarrel with each other over obsolete matters of State reform, upon which they have hitherto entertained conflicting opinions. Such men as Adams, Phillips, Allen, Palfrey, Sumner,

does the President, what does his "organ," with their everlasting depreciation of agitation, think of them? What do the demagogues, who have been laboring to narcotize the public mind with the delusion of a "final settlement" of the Slavery Question, think of them?

The Missouri Compromise, so called, has been regarded as a finality for the last thirty-three years. As a part of the arrangement embraced in it, Missouri is a State of this Union. During the agitation of the Territorial Question in 1848, not the most ultra of the slaveholders proposed to disturb it, although repeated attempts were made to extend the line it draws between Slavery and Freedom, to the Pacific coast. And yet, the President of the Senate, after the acquiescence of one generation in this Missouri Compromise, solemnly announces his purpose to resign his place in that body, rather than vote for the organization of a Territorial Government on the basis of that Compromise! Does he stand alone? Would he, a Western Senator, dare to take a position so monstrously extravagant, if he were not assured of confederates from the South? A Compromise from which Slavery can expect advantage, we must regard as a holy covenant, its violation is a sin not to be forgiven—but should it happen in the change of events, Liberty, and not Slavery, is to be the gainer, trample it under foot! This is the attitude of Mr. Atchison. He and his associates proceed on the assumption that the only use of the Federal Union is to nationalize and eternalize Slavery.

SLAVERY IN ILLINOIS.

QUINCY, ADAMS CO., ILL., Dec. 2, 1853. To the Editor of the *National Era*: Recently a man in this county found a colored man in the woods, sick and emaciated with the ague, who appeared to be a fugitive slave. He took the colored man to his house, and in the event, lodged him in jail to await a claimant. At the end of six weeks the man (or slave) was sold for his jail fees, "according to law." A man was over from Missouri at the sale, who boasted that he intended to have the fellow for a slave. A friend declared he would not, and between them he was run up to six hundred dollars, and bid off to the friend, who left him in jail, and soon got out a writ of *habeas corpus*, to ascertain the slave's right to freedom. Every man being presumed to be free till proved to be a slave, no testimony appearing to prove him thus, he was released by the court, with testimony to that effect; and, in view of the threats to enslave him, he was cared for by those who prefer to help a man to freedom rather than to enslave him. This is only a meager outline of one incident among many.

The foregoing statement is confirmed by the Quincy newspapers. It furnishes a beautiful illustration of the workings of the Black Code of Illinois. Had it not been for the interposition of this Anti-Slavery friend, the poor man would have been consigned to Slavery for life. True, he could only be sold for one month, but there would be no legal provision for his enfranchisement at the end of that time. The Quincy *Whig*, of November 22d, remarks:

"It is asserted, and we fully believe it, that one individual, who was a bidder at the sale, intended, in case he succeeded in purchasing the negro, to take him to a slave State and sell him or trust him as a slave for life. We say that we believe this, and the facts in the case that are known to the public are sufficient evidence of it."

The Legislature that enacted the infamous law under which the sale took place, provided no safeguard against such an abuse. Had the poor man been "struck off" to the Missouri bidder, he might have found himself at the end of the month on a solitary plantation on the Red river, beyond hope of redemption.

Not to say anything of Christianity, Civilization must be at a very low ebb in a State that can sanction a statute so utterly unprincipled and villanous. The distinguished Senator from

